

REDUCTIONS AND SPECIAL PARTS OF CLOSURES

NEIL EPSTEIN

ABSTRACT. We provide an axiomatic framework for working with a wide variety of closure operations on ideals and submodules in commutative algebra, including notions of reduction, independence, spread, and special parts of closures. This framework is applied to tight, Frobenius, and integral closures. Applications are given to evolutions and special Briançon-Skoda theorems.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most useful notions in commutative algebra is that of the closure operation on ideals, or more generally on submodules. Much of the time, authors concentrate on the properties of one particular closure operation, so the general notion itself is not always given a proper definition¹. The following encapsulates what most authors mean:

Definition 1.1. Let R be a ring, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a set of R -modules (often either just R , or all (finitely generated) R -modules). A *closure operation* c sends any submodule L of a module $M \in \mathcal{M}$ to another submodule L_M^c of M , subject to the following axioms

- (1) For any submodule L of any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $L \subseteq L_M^c = (L_M^c)_M^c$
- (2) If $K \subseteq L$ are submodules of some $M \in \mathcal{M}$, then $K_M^c \subseteq L_M^c$.
- (3) Let $g : M \rightarrow M'$ be a homomorphism of R -modules in $\mathcal{M}$. Then for any submodule $L \subseteq M$, $g(L_M^c) \subseteq g(L)_{M'}^c$.

Familiar examples of closure operations on ideals include tight closure, integral closure, and the radical. The definition above is very broad, so it is useful to identify additional properties that may not hold for all closure operations. For instance, in [Eps05], we introduced the following notions for closure operations on ideals, here generalized to the module case:

Definition 1.2. A closure operation c on a class $\mathcal{M}$ of R -modules is *Nakayama* if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is local and for every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and submodules $K \subseteq L \subseteq M$ such that $K \subseteq L \subseteq (K + \mathfrak{m}L)_M^c$, we have $K_M^c = L_M^c$.

Date: February 26, 2010.

¹One counterexample is the recent paper [Vas09], which gives structure to sets of closure operations satisfying certain properties.

Given $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and elements $z_1, \dots, z_t \in M$, they are *c-independent* (relative to M) if for all $1 \leq i \leq t$, we have

$$z_i \notin \left(\sum_{j \neq i} Rz_j \right)_M^c.$$

A submodule $L \subseteq M$ is *c-independent* if it has a *c-independent* generating set, and it is *strongly c-independent* if every minimal generating set for L is *c-independent*.

Given a submodule $L \subseteq M \in \mathcal{M}$, a *c-reduction* $K \subseteq L$ of L in M is a submodule such that $K_M^c = L_M^c$. It is *minimal* if there is no proper submodule $P \subsetneq K$ which is a *c-reduction* of L . If minimal *c-reductions* exist, and if every minimal *c-reduction* of L in M has the same minimal number of generators, we call this common number the *c-spread* of L in M , denoted $\ell_M^c(L)$.

As a closure on ideals in a local ring, it is clear that integral closure is Nakayama, and we showed in [Eps05] that tight closure in this context is as well. Radical, however, is not Nakayama. Moreover, we showed that for any Nakayama closure c , minimal *c-reductions* exist, and they are exactly the strongly *c-independent c-reductions*. Although this result was stated for ideals, the exact same proof shows it to be true in this wider context.

Also in that paper, we used Vraciu's notion of *special tight closure* to prove that under mild conditions on the ring, minimal generating sets of minimal $*$ -reductions of an ideal all have the same size generating sets.

Accordingly, in this note we generalize and axiomatize the notion of the *special part of a closure*, and we use it to obtain interesting results for Frobenius, integral, and tight closures. *Except where otherwise noted, in this paper R will always denote a Noetherian local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ and residue field k .*

Most of this work was completed years ago as part of my dissertation. I did not submit the paper for publication at the time. However, as there are now several papers which use the ideas in the paper (e.g. [Vra06], [EH], and [FV]), I have been convinced to publish it.

2. AXIOMS FOR SPECIAL PARTS OF CLOSURES

Definition 2.1. Let c be a closure operation on submodules of an R -module M . Then *csp* is a *special part of c for M* if the following four axioms hold whenever L and N are submodules of M .

- (1) L_M^{csp} is a submodule of M .
- (2) $\mathfrak{m}L \subseteq L_M^{\text{csp}} \subseteq L^c$.

- (3) $(L_M^c)^{\text{csp}} = L_M^{\text{csp}} = (L_M^{\text{csp}})^c_M$.
- (4) If $L \subseteq N \subseteq (L + N_M^{\text{csp}})^c_M$, then $N \subseteq L_M^c$.

If $M = R$, we say csp is a *special part of c for ideals*. If the closure operation c is only defined for ideals, we simply say csp is a *special part of c* . If c and csp are defined at least on all submodules of finitely generated R -modules, we say that csp is a *special part of c* .

If the ambient module is understood, sometimes we write L^c in place of L_M^c . In particular if $M = R$ (so L is now an ideal), we almost always leave off the ambient module R in the notation.

Note the following consequences of the definition:

Lemma 2.2. *Let c be a closure operation on submodules of M and csp a special part of c . Then*

- c is a Nakayama closure.
- If $L_M^c \subseteq N_M^c$, then $L_M^{\text{csp}} \subseteq N_M^{\text{csp}}$.
- For any c -independent submodule L , $\mathfrak{m}L = L \cap L_M^{\text{csp}}$.

Proof. c is Nakayama because of axioms (4) and (2) of Definition 2.1. For this reason, we call axiom (4) the *Nakayama property*.

If $L_M^c \subseteq N_M^c$, then by axiom (3) of Definition 2.1, $L_M^{\text{csp}} = (L^c)^{\text{csp}}_M \subseteq (N^c)^{\text{csp}}_M = N_M^{\text{csp}}$.

Finally, suppose that L is a c -independent submodule of M , and let $z \in L \cap L_M^{\text{csp}}$. Let $z_1, \dots, z_n$ be a c -independent generating set of L . Then there are elements $r_j \in R$ such that $z = \sum_{j=1}^n r_j z_j$. If $z \notin \mathfrak{m}L$, then there is some j with $r_j \notin \mathfrak{m}$. Without loss of generality, $j = 1$, and by dividing by r_1 , we may assume that $r_1 = 1$. That is,

$$z = z_1 + \sum_{j=2}^n r_j z_j \in L_M^{\text{csp}}.$$

Let $N = (z_2, \dots, z_n)$. Then by the above equation, we have $z_1 \in N + L_M^{\text{csp}}$, which implies that $L \subseteq N + L_M^{\text{csp}}$. Then by axiom (4), $L \subseteq N_M^c$, so that $z_1 \in N_M^c$. But this contradicts the c -independence of $z_1, \dots, z_n$.

Thus, $z \in \mathfrak{m}L$. □

3. THE SPECIAL PART OF TIGHT CLOSURE

The ideal case of the special part of tight closure was introduced by Vraciu in [Vra02]. Further work appears in [Eps05] and [Vra06]. Here's the submodule version:

Definition 3.1. For finitely generated R -modules $N \subseteq M$, we define the *special part of the tight closure* of N in M to be the set

$$N_M^{\text{sp}} = \{z \in M \mid \exists q \text{ such that } z^q \in (\mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]})_{F^e(M)}^*\}$$

Most of the proof that sp is a special part of $*$ for ideals is in [Eps05], and the proofs for the submodule case are identical.

Note also that the special part of tight closure can be computed modulo minimal primes.

In [Vra06], Vraciu introduces the notions of $*$ -independence modulo an ideal, $*$ -spread modulo an ideal, and (minimal) $*$ -reductions of an ideal modulo another ideal. Note that $*$ -independence modulo J is just $*$ -independence in the R -module R/J , (minimal) $*$ -reductions of I modulo J correspond exactly with (minimal) $*$ -reductions of I/J in the module R/J , and $\ell_J^*(I) = \ell_{R/J}^*(I/J)$ whenever such a number is defined. She observes that the proof of [Eps05, Theorem 5.1] can be “modified slightly” to show that $\ell_J^*(I)$ exists in her context of a normal local domain. Essentially the same modification shows that whenever R is excellent and analytically irreducible and $L \subseteq M$ is any inclusion of finitely generated modules, then $\ell_M^*(L)$ exists.

4. ANALYTIC F -INDEPENDENCE, AND THE SPECIAL PART OF FROBENIUS CLOSURE

In this section, we assume only that R is a Noetherian local ring of prime characteristic $p > 0$.

Definition 4.1. Let $N \subseteq M$ be finitely generated R -modules. The *special part of the Frobenius closure* of N in M is the submodule

$$N_M^{F\text{sp}} := \{z \in M \mid \exists q = p^e \text{ such that } z^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}\}.$$

It is equivalent to say that there is some q such that $z^q \in (\mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]})_M^F$.

Proposition 4.2. $F\text{sp}$ is a special part of the Frobenius closure, in the sense of Definition 2.1, for all finitely generated R -modules.

Proof. For property (1) of the definition, if $y, z \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$, there is some q with $y^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$ and some q' with $z^{q'} \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q']}$, and without loss of generality $q \geq q'$. Then

$$z^q = (z^{q'})^{q/q'} \in (\mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q']})_{F^{e'}(M)}^{[q/q']} = \mathfrak{m}^{[q/q']}N_M^{[q]} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]},$$

and thus $(y - z)^q = y^q - z^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$, so $y - z \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$. Moreover, for any $r \in R$, $(ry)^q = r^q y^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$, so that $ry \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$.

For property (2), $\mathfrak{m}N \subseteq N_M^{F\text{sp}}$ by taking $q = 1$ in the definition, and $N_M^{F\text{sp}} \subseteq N_M^F$ because $\mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]} \subseteq N_M^{[q]}$.

For property (3), suppose $L \subseteq N \subseteq M$ are finitely generated submodules and $N \subseteq (L + N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^F$, then since N is finitely generated, there is some q such that

$$(1) \quad N_M^{[q]} \subseteq L_M^{[q]} + (N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^{[q]}$$

Since $N_M^{F\text{sp}}$ is finitely generated, there is some q' such that $(N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^{[q']} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q']}$. Replacing the q in (1) by $\max\{q, q'\}$, that containment yields

$$N_M^{[q]} \subseteq L_M^{[q]} + \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}.$$

Then by the standard Nakayama lemma, $N_M^{[q]} \subseteq L_M^{[q]}$, which proves that $N \subseteq L_M^F$, and hence property (3).

Finally, for property (4), first suppose $z \in (N_M^F)_M^{F\text{sp}}$. Then there is some q such that both $z^q \in \mathfrak{m}(N_M^F)_M^{[q]}$ and $(N_M^F)_M^{[q]} = N_M^{[q]}$, which combine to make $z^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$, and hence that $z \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$. Similarly, if $z \in (N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^F$, there is some q such that both $z^q \in (N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^{[q]}$ and $(N_M^{F\text{sp}})_M^{[q]} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$, which combine to show that $z^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$, and hence that $z \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$. $\square$

The question immediately arises in which situations we have a special Frobenius closure decomposition:

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring of characteristic $p > 0$ with perfect residue field. Then for any finitely generated R -module M and any submodule $N \subseteq M$, $N_M^F = N + N_M^{F\text{sp}}$.*

Proof. The containment $\supseteq$ is obvious. So suppose that $z \in N_M^F$. Then there is some q such that $z^q \in N_M^{[q]}$.

Let $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ be any generating set of N . Then we have

$$z^q = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i^q,$$

where $a_i \in R$. Let r be the number of a_i 's that are not in $\mathfrak{m}$. We can rearrange the z_i 's in such a way that $a_i \notin \mathfrak{m}$ if $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ if $r < i \leq n$. Since $a_i \notin \mathfrak{m}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is perfect, there exist $u_i \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ and $m_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that $a_i = u_i^q + m_i$ whenever $i \leq r$. Hence,

$$\left(z - \sum_{i=1}^r u_i z_i \right)^q = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i z_i^q + \sum_{i=r+1}^n a_i z_i^q \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}.$$

That is, $z - \sum_{i=1}^r u_i z_i \in N_M^{F\text{sp}}$, so that $z \in N + N_M^{F\text{sp}}$. $\square$

By analyzing the proof of [Eps05, Theorem 5.1], if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring, c is any closure operation on (submodules of) a class of modules $\mathcal{M}$ with a special part csp , and if for all R -modules $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and submodules $L \subseteq M$ one has $L^c = L + L^{csp}$, then submodules of $M \in \mathcal{M}$ have spread, in the sense that every minimal c -reduction has the same minimal number of generators as every other. Hence, if k is a perfect field, then F -spread is well-defined for submodules of any finitely generated R -module. The assumption on the field can be dropped too.

However, we present below a different way to prove that F -spread is well-defined, using notions analogous to the original definitions of analytic spread and analytic independence from Northcott and Rees [NR54] for Frobenius closure, inspired also in part by Adela Vraciu's work on $*$ -independence in [Vra02]:

Definition 4.4. Fix a finitely-generated R -module M , as before. Let $z_1, \dots, z_n \in N$, where N is a submodule of M . Then we say that $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are *analytically F -independent in N* [resp. *analytically F -independent*] if for any power q of p and any polynomial ϕ of the form

$$\phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) = c_1 X_1^q + \dots + c_n X_n^q,$$

where q is a power of p , the X_i are indeterminates, and the c_i are elements of R , such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$ [resp. such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0 \in N_M^{[q]}$], it follows that the coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_n$ of ϕ are all in $\mathfrak{m}$.

Lemma 4.5. For elements $z_1, \dots, z_n \in M$, with $L = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are analytically F -independent.
- (2) $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are analytically F -independent in L .
- (3) $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are analytically F -independent in any submodule N of M such that L is an F -reduction of N .
- (4) $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are F -independent.
- (5) For any power q of p , $z_1^q, \dots, z_n^q$ form a minimal set of generators for $L_M^{[q]}$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let $\phi = c_1 X_1^q + \dots + c_n X_n^q$ such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathfrak{m}(z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$. Then there exist $m_1, \dots, m_n \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that

$$c_1 z_1^q + \dots + c_n z_n^q = m_1 z_1^q + \dots + m_n z_n^q.$$

Let $\psi = (c_1 - m_1)X_1^q + \dots + (c_n - m_n)X_n^q$. Then $\psi(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0$, so that by analytic F -independence, $c_i - m_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ for all i . Thus, since $m_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ for all i , it follows that $c_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ for all i .

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Let q' be a power of p such that $N_M^{[q']} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q']}$, and let $\phi = c_1 X_1^q + \dots + c_n X_n^q$ be such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathfrak{m}N_M^{[q]}$. If

$q \geq q'$, then $N_M^{[q]} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$, so that by analytic F -independence in $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$, all the c_i are in $\mathfrak{m}$. On the other hand, if $q < q'$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{q'/q} &\in \mathfrak{m}^{[q'/q]} N_M^{[q']} \\ &= \mathfrak{m}^{[q'/q]} (z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q']} \\ &\subseteq \mathfrak{m} (z_1, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q']}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by analytic F -independence in $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$, we have that $c_i^{q'/q} \in \mathfrak{m}$ for each i . But $\mathfrak{m}$ is radical, so $c_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ for all i .

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) : Obvious, since $0 \in \mathfrak{m} N_M^{[q]}$ for all N and all q .

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) : If $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are not F -independent, then without loss of generality $z_1 \in (z_2, \dots, z_n)_M^F$. Then there is some q with $z_1^q \in (z_2, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$. Thus, there are choices $c_2, \dots, c_n \in R$ such that

$$z_1^q + c_2 z_2^q + \dots + c_n z_n^q.$$

If we set $\phi = X_1^q + c_2 X_2^q + \dots + c_n X_n^q$, then $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0$ but not all of the coefficients of ϕ are in $\mathfrak{m}$ (since the coefficient for X_1^q is 1), which shows that $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are not analytically F -independent.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1) : The proof that (1) implies (4) can pretty much be reversed: If $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are not analytically F -independent, then there is some polynomial $\phi = c_1 X_1^q + \dots + c_n X_n^q$ such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0$ and at least one of the c_i is a unit. We may assume that $i = 1$. Then

$$z_1^q = -c_1^{-1} (c_2 z_2^q + \dots + c_n z_n^q),$$

so that $z_1 \in (z_2, \dots, z_n)_M^F$, and $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are not F -independent.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) : The elements $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are F -independent in L if and only if for any power q of p , whenever $c_1 z_1^q + \dots + c_n z_n^q \in \mathfrak{m} (z_1^q, \dots, z_n^q) = \mathfrak{m} L_M^{[q]}$, it follows that every $c_i \in \mathfrak{m}$. This is in turn equivalent to the statement that for any power q of p , $z_1^q, \dots, z_n^q$ is a minimal generating set of $L_M^{[q]}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let $z_1, \dots, z_n \in M$ be F -independent. Then the module L that they generate is strongly F -independent.*

Proof. Let $y_1, \dots, y_n$ be another minimal set of generators. Then the

vector $\begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}$ may be obtained by multiplying the vector $\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_n \end{pmatrix}$ by an

invertible $n \times n$ matrix of elements of R . Arguing as in Vraciu [Vra02], we may reduce to the case where $y_1 = z_1 + dz_2$ and $y_i = z_i$ for all $i \geq 2$. Here d is some element of R .

Now, it is clear $y_i \notin (y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)_M^F$ as long as $i \geq 3$, for in those cases $y_i = z_i$ and the module for which we claim its non-membership is $(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)_M^F$.

Next, suppose that $y_1 \in (y_2, \dots, y_n)_M^F$. Then for some $c \in R$,

$$z_1^q + (d^q + c)z_2^q = (z_1 + dz_2)^q + cz_2^q \in (z_3, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}.$$

Hence, $z_1^q \in (z_2, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$, contradicting the fact that the z_i are F -independent.

Finally suppose that $y_2 \in (y_1, y_3, \dots, y_n)_M^F$. Then for some q and some $c \in R$,

$$cz_1^q + (1 + cd^q)z_2^q \in (z_3, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}.$$

If c is a unit, this implies that $z_1^q \in (z_2, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$, which is a contradiction. If c is not a unit, then $(1 + cd^q)$ is a unit, which implies that $z_2^q \in (z_1, z_3, \dots, z_n)_M^{[q]}$, also a contradiction.

Hence, $y_1, \dots, y_n$ are F -independent elements, as was to be shown. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *Let N be any submodule of M . Then for any minimal F -reduction L of N , the minimal number of generators of L is equal to the eventual minimal number of generators of the modules $N_M^{[q]}$ for large enough choices of the power q of p . Hence, Frobenius closure has spread.*

Proof. Let $z_1, \dots, z_t$ be a minimal set of generators for L . Since $z_1, \dots, z_t$ are F -independent, then for any power q of p , $z_1^q, \dots, z_t^q$ form a minimal set of generators for $L_M^{[q]}$. On the other hand, for sufficiently large q , $L_M^{[q]} = N_M^{[q]}$. Hence the minimal number of generators of such an $N_M^{[q]}$ is always equal to the minimal number of generators of L . $\square$

5. SPECIAL PART OF INTEGRAL CLOSURE

Note: The paper [EH] generalizes some results of this section (e.g. Proposition 5.3) though the point of view is very different from the one adopted here, in several respects.

For background on integral closure of ideals, the author recommends the recent book [HS06] of Huneke and Swanson, and in particular Chapter 10 on Rees valuations.

Definition 5.1. For an ideal I in a Noetherian local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$, define the *special part of the integral closure of I* to be the set

$$I^{-\text{sp}} := \{x \in R \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } x^n \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^n}\}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring, and $J \subseteq I$ ideals in R . Then $I^{-\text{sp}}$ is an ideal, $J^{-\text{sp}} \subseteq I^{-\text{sp}}$, and if R has prime characteristic $p > 0$, then $I^{*\text{sp}} \subseteq I^{-\text{sp}}$.*

Proof. For the first statement, let $x, y \in I^{-\text{sp}}$ and $a \in R$. It is obvious from the definition that $ax \in I^{-\text{sp}}$. So we only need to show that $x + y \in I^{-\text{sp}}$.

There exist positive integers r and s such that $x^r \in (\mathfrak{m}I^r)^-$ and $y^s \in (\mathfrak{m}I^s)^-$. Let $n = rs$. Then

$$x^n = (x^r)^s \in ((\mathfrak{m}I^r)^-)^s \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}^s I^{rs})^- \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-,$$

and by symmetry we also have $y^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$. So it suffices to show that if $x^n, y^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$, then $(x + y)^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$. Since integral closure may be computed modulo minimal primes, we may assume from this point on that R is an integral domain.

Now, by one of the equivalent definitions for integral closure in integral domains, there is some $c \neq 0$ such that for all positive integers t ,

$$(2) \quad cx^{nt}, cy^{nt} \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^t.$$

Note also the general fact that arises from looking at monomials that for any nonnegative integers n and t :

$$(3) \quad (x + y)^{n(t+1)} \in (x + y)^n (x^n, y^n)^t.$$

Let $d = c^2(x + y)^n$. Clearly $d \neq 0$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} d((x + y)^n)^t &= c^2(x + y)^{n(t+1)} \\ &\in c^2(x^n, y^n)^t, && \text{by (3)} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^t (cx^{nj})(cy^{n(t-j)}) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{j=0}^t (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^j (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^{t-j} && \text{by (2)} \\ &= (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^t. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(x + y)^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$, as was to be shown.

It is obvious that $J^{-\text{sp}} \subseteq I^{-\text{sp}}$.

The third statement follows from the fact that

$$(\mathfrak{m}I^{[q]})^* \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}I^q)^* \subseteq \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^q}.$$

for all powers $q = p^e$ of p .

□

We need the following symbols, following Samuel (op. cit.):

- $v(I) := \inf\{v(x) \mid x \in I\}$ and
- $v_I(x) := \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty \mid x \in I^n\}$

First note that for any commutative ring R , any $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \infty)$ -valued valuation v defined on R , and any proper ideal J of R , we have $v(\bar{J}) = v(J)$.

Proof. Since $J \subseteq \bar{J}$, $v(\bar{J}) \leq v(J)$. On the other hand, let $x \in \bar{J}$. Then there is some k such that $x^{n+k} \in J^n(J, x)^k \subseteq J^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$(n+k)v(x) = v(x^{n+k}) \geq v(J^n) = nv(J),$$

so that $v(x) \geq \frac{n}{n+k} \cdot v(J)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $v(x) \geq v(J)$, whence $v(\bar{J}) \geq v(J)$. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. *Let I be an ideal of R and let $v_1, \dots, v_t$ be the Rees valuations of I , with centers $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_t$ respectively. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_t$ be their intersection. Then the following are equivalent for any $x \in R$:*

- (1) *There is some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^n \in I^{n+1}$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*
- (2) *There is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^n \in I^{n+1}$.*
- (3) *There is some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^r \in (I^{r+1})^-$.*
- (4) *There is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^n \in \mathfrak{q}I^n$.*
- (5) *There is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^n \in (\mathfrak{q}I^n)^-$.*
- (6) *$v_i(x) > v_i(I)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.*
- (7) *$x \in (IR_{\mathfrak{p}_i})^{-\text{sp}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.*

In particular, if I is $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary, then $x \in I^{-\text{sp}}$ iff $x^n \in I^{n+1}$ for some n iff $v(x) > v(I)$ for all Rees valuations v of I .

Proof. It is obvious that (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) (taking $n = r$) and (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5). Also, (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4) because $I \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$, which implies that $I \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): There is some integer n_0 such that for all positive integers k ,

$$(x^r)^{n_0+k} \in (I^{r+1})^k.$$

In particular, letting $k = n_0r + 1$ and $n = n_0r^2 + n_0r + r$, we have

$$x^n = x^{n_0r^2+n_0r+r} = (x^r)^{n_0+k} \in (I^{r+1})^k = I^{n_0r^2+n_0r+r+1} = I^{n+1}.$$

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (6): Suppose $x^n \in \overline{\mathfrak{q}I^n}$, and let $v = v_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq t$. Then we have:

$$nv(x) = v(x^n) \geq v(\overline{\mathfrak{q}I^n}) = v(\mathfrak{q}I^n) \geq v(\mathfrak{p}_i I^n) = v(\mathfrak{p}_i) + nv(I) > nv(I).$$

Hence, $v_i(x) > v_i(I)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.²

(6) $\Rightarrow$ (1): By the Rees valuation theorem [Ree88, Theorem 4.16],

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_I(x^n)}{n} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq t} \frac{v_i(x)}{v_i(I)} > 1.$$

So there is some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{v_I(x^n)}{n} > 1$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Hence for such n , $v_I(x^n) > n$, whence since v_I is integer-valued, $v_I(x^n) \geq n + 1$, which means that $x^n \in I^{n+1}$.

(7) $\Rightarrow$ (6) is clear from the definitions. (5) $\Rightarrow$ (7) is because integral closure is persistent and $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.

The last statement follows from the fact that if I is $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary then each of its Rees valuations has center $\mathfrak{m}$. $\square$

At this point, the reader may protest that we haven't yet shown that $-\text{sp}$ is a special part of the integral closure operation. That situation will soon be remedied, but first we note the following important lemma of Lipman's from Huneke's paper:

Lemma 5.4. [Hun86, Lemma 3.4] *Let R be a Noetherian local integral domain, let I be an ideal of R , let K be the quotient field of R , and let $x \in R$. Then if x is in IV for each discrete valuation ring V between R and K whose center on R is $\mathfrak{m}$, then $x \in I^-$.*

Next, note the following 'asymptotic' property associated with the definition of $-\text{sp}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring, $I \subseteq R$ a proper ideal, $x \in R$, and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_+$. If $x^{n_0} \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^{n_0}}$, then $x^n \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^n}$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*

Proof. First assume that R is an integral domain. Let V be any discrete valuation ring between R and the quotient field K of R whose center on R is $\mathfrak{m}$, and let v be its associated discrete valuation on K . Then we have

$$n_0 v(x) = v(x^{n_0}) \geq v(\overline{\mathfrak{m}I^{n_0}}) = v(\mathfrak{m}) + n_0 v(I)$$

so that $v(x) \geq \frac{v(\mathfrak{m})}{n_0} + v(I)$. Then for any $n \geq n_0$, we have $v(x) \geq \frac{v(\mathfrak{m})}{n} + v(I)$, so that

$$v(x^n) = nv(x) \geq v(\mathfrak{m}) + nv(I) = v(\mathfrak{m}I^n).$$

That is, $x^n \in \mathfrak{m}I^n V$ for all such V . Hence, by Lemma 5.4, $x^n \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^n}$.

²We have proved a bit more here, actually. In particular,

$$v_i(x) - v_i(I) \geq \frac{v_i(\mathfrak{p}_i)}{n}.$$

If we drop the assumption that R is a domain, the result follows immediately from the fact that integral closure in R can be computed modulo the minimal primes of R . $\square$

Lemma 5.6. $x \in I^{-\text{sp}}$ if and only if this is true modulo all minimal primes of R .

Proof. This follows immediately from the above lemma and the fact that the corresponding statement is true for integral closure. $\square$

Proposition 5.7. $-\text{sp}$ is a special part of integral closure, in the sense of Definition 2.1.

Proof. We already showed that $I^{-\text{sp}}$ is an ideal (i.e. axiom 1 of the definition), and it is clear from the definitions that $\mathfrak{m}I \subseteq I^{-\text{sp}} \subseteq I^-$ (axiom 2).

Now for (3), suppose that $J \subseteq I \subseteq (J + I^{-\text{sp}})^-$. First, we may assume without loss of generality that I is integrally closed. Next, recall that when we were proving that $I^{-\text{sp}}$ is an ideal, we showed that for any n and any $x, y \in R$, if $x^n, y^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$ then $(x + y)^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$. It follows easily from this fact along with Lemma 5.5 that there is some n such that for any $x \in I^{-\text{sp}}$, $x^n \in (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^-$. Thus, if $\mu = \mu(I)$, then

$$(I^{-\text{sp}})^{\mu n} = (I^{-\text{sp}})^n (I^{-\text{sp}})^{n(\mu-1)} \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}I^n)^- I^{n(\mu-1)} \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}I^{\mu n})^-$$

There is some r with $I^{r+1} \subseteq (J + I^{-\text{sp}})I^r$. Then letting $\mu = \mu(I)$ and $m = \mu n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (I^m)^{2r+2} &= (I^{r+1})^{2m} \subseteq (J^m + (I^{-\text{sp}})^m)(J + I^{-\text{sp}})^m I^{2rm} \\ &\subseteq (J^m + (\mathfrak{m}I^m)^-)(I^m)^{2r+1} \end{aligned}$$

Now, after modding out by a minimal prime, we may assume that R is a domain. Let v be any $\mathfrak{m}$ -centered valuation. Then

$$(2r + 2)v(I^m) = v((I^m)^{2r+2}) \geq v(J^m + (\mathfrak{m}I^m)^-) + (2r + 1)v(I^m),$$

so that

$$v(I^m) \geq \min\{v(J^m), v((\mathfrak{m}I^m)^-)\} \geq \min\{v(J^m), 1 + v(I^m)\}.$$

Thus, $mv(I) = v(I^m) \geq v(J^m) = mv(J)$, which means that $v(I) \geq v(J)$. Since this holds for all $\mathfrak{m}$ -centered valuations v , it follows from Lemma 5.4 that $I \subseteq J^-$.

Finally we prove (axiom 4) for integral closure. Note first that for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p}$,

$$\frac{I^{-\text{sp}} + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} = \left(\frac{I + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} \right)^{-\text{sp}}$$

and

$$\frac{I^- + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} = \left(\frac{I + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} \right)^-.$$

Hence, if it holds for integral domains, then we have for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of R :

$$\frac{(I^{-\text{sp}})^- + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} = \left(\left(\frac{I + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} \right)^{-\text{sp}} \right)^- = \left(\frac{I + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}} \right)^{-\text{sp}} = \frac{(I^-)^{-\text{sp}} + \mathfrak{p}}{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Thus (axiom 4) for integral closure holds in R . So we may assume from now on that R is an integral domain.

Suppose $x \in (I^-)^{-\text{sp}}$. Then for some positive integer n , we have $x^n \in (\mathfrak{m}(\bar{I})^n)^-$. Hence, by Lemma 5.4, for any valuation v on K centered on $\mathfrak{m}$ in R , where K is the fraction field of R , we have:

$$v(x^n) \geq v(\mathfrak{m}(\bar{I})^n) = v(\mathfrak{m}) + nv(\bar{I}) = v(\mathfrak{m}) + nv(I) = v(\mathfrak{m}I^n).$$

Hence, by Lemma 5.4 again, $x^n \in \overline{(\mathfrak{m}I^n)}$, so that $x \in I^{-\text{sp}}$.

Now let $x \in (I^{-\text{sp}})^-$. Then there is some integer r and some elements $a_i \in (I^{-\text{sp}})^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that

$$x^r = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i x^{r-i}.$$

Take any valuation v of K centered on $\mathfrak{m}$ in R . Then

$$rv(x) = v(x^r) \geq \min\{v(a_i) + (r-i)v(x) \mid 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$

In particular, for each v there exists some i between 1 and r (dependent on v) such that $rv(x) \geq v(a_i) + (r-i)v(x)$. Hence,

$$v(x) \geq \frac{v(a_i)}{i}.$$

But there exists some t such that for all j , $a_j^t \in (\mathfrak{m}I^{jt})^-$, so that in particular,

$$v(a_i) \geq \frac{v(\mathfrak{m})}{t} + iv(I).$$

Combining the latest two displayed equations, we have

$$v(x^{rt}) = rtv(x) \geq \frac{rv(\mathfrak{m})}{i} + rtv(I) \geq v(\mathfrak{m}) + rtv(I) = v(\mathfrak{m}I^{rt}),$$

since $r \geq i$. Noting that r and t are independent of the choice of v , Lemma 5.4 then implies that $x^{rt} \in (\mathfrak{m}I^{rt})^-$, so that $x \in I^{-\text{sp}}$. $\square$

6. EVOLUTIONS AND FERMAT’S LAST THEOREM

After Eisenbud and Mazur [EM97] connected “evolutionary stability” and the Wiles-Taylor proof of Fermat’s last theorem with symbolic squares, Hübl [Hüb99] related their methods to certain questions about integral closure of ideals, as well as the fiber cone of and associated graded ring to an ideal.

In particular, he showed that if k is a field of characteristic 0, and S is a reduced local algebra essentially of finite type over k , then S/k is evolutionarily stable if and only if it has a presentation $S = R/I$, R/k smooth, such that (R, I) satisfies the following condition “(NN)”:

$$I \cap \{f \in R \mid \exists n \text{ such that } f^n \in I^{n+1}\} = \mathfrak{m}I.$$

In section 3 of his paper, Hübl considers the following conditions on a ring and an ideal (R, I) . (MR) says that if $f \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$, then f is contained in some minimal reduction of I . Condition (AR) says that

$$I \cap \{f \in R \mid \exists n \text{ such that } x^n \in \mathfrak{m}I^n\} = \mathfrak{m}I.$$

Call the following condition (SP):

$$I \cap I^{-\text{sp}} = \mathfrak{m}I.$$

Clearly (MR) $\Rightarrow$ (SP) $\Rightarrow$ (AR) $\Rightarrow$ (NN), with none of the arrows reversible. Moreover, since $-\text{sp}$ is in fact a special part of integral closure (Proposition 5.7), it follows from Lemma 2.2 that whenever I is bar-independent, it satisfies (SP), hence also (NN).

Thus, if R is a regular local ring essentially of finite type over a field k of characteristic 0, and I is a radical bar-independent ideal (e.g. I may be a radical ideal with no proper reductions), R/I is an evolutionarily stable algebra over k .

7. SPECIAL TIGHT CLOSURE BRIANÇON-SKODA THEOREMS

The history of “Briançon-Skoda theorems” goes back more than 35 years and could itself be the subject of a short essay. The original theorem, proved in 1974 by Briançon and Skoda is as follows (with notation slightly altered):

Theorem 7.1. [BS74, Théorème 3] *Let I be an n -generated ideal in the convergent power series ring $R = \mathbb{C}\{z_1, \dots, z_d\}$. Then if $t = \inf\{n, d\}$, $(I^-)^t \subseteq I$.*

An algebraic proof, which generalized the theorem to *all* regular local rings, was given in 1981 by Lipman and Sathaye:

Theorem 7.2. [LS81, special case of Theorem 1] *Let I be an ideal in a regular local ring R , let ℓ be the analytic spread of I , and let $w \geq 0$ be an integer. Then $(I^{\ell+w})^- \subseteq I^{w+1}$.*

This is a generalization because the analytic spread of an ideal is bounded above by both the number of generators of the ideal and the dimension of the ring.

In 1990, Hochster and Huneke gave a tight closure proof, generalizing the Briançon-Skoda Theorem to *all* rings of characteristic p (and later, for rings of equal characteristic zero, after tight closure was well-defined for such rings), but not including the mixed characteristic case:

Theorem 7.3. ([HH90, Theorem 5.6] and [HH99, Theorem 4.1.5]) *Let I be an ideal in a Noetherian local ring R of equal characteristic, let ℓ be the analytic spread of I , and let $w \geq 0$ be an integer. Then $(I^{\ell+w})^- \subseteq (I^{w+1})^*$.*

The reason why this generalizes Theorem 7.1 (and Theorem 7.2 when R contains a field) is that $(I^{w+1})^* = I^{w+1}$ if R is regular. Theorem 7.3 is really a theorem about the tight closure of an ideal capturing the integral closure of a not-much-higher power of that ideal. It is noteworthy that although Theorem 7.2 has a very difficult proof, Theorem 7.3 (at least in characteristic p) is extremely easy once the foundations of tight closure theory are laid down.

Similarly, we can prove “special” versions, as follows:

Proposition 7.4 (Special tight closure Briançon-Skoda theorem). *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring of characteristic $p > 0$, and I a proper ideal of R . If $n = \mu(I)$ and w is any nonnegative integer, then*

$$(I^{n+w})^{-\text{sp}} \subseteq (I^{w+1})^{*\text{sp}}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality R is an integral domain, since the special parts of both the integral and tight closures can be computed modulo minimal primes.

Suppose $0 \neq x \in (I^{n+w})^{-\text{sp}}$, where $n = \mu(I)$. Then by Lemma 5.5, there is some power q_1 of p with $q_1 \geq \mu(I)$ such that $x^{q_1} \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}I^{q_1(n+w)}}$. Let q_0 be a power of p such that $q_0 \geq \mu(\mathfrak{m})$. Then there exists some integer k such that for all powers q of p ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^{q_1 k} (x^{q_1 q_0})^q &= x^{q_1(k+qq_0)} \in (\mathfrak{m}I^{(n+w)q_1})^{qq_0} \\ &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{qq_0} (I^{n+w})^{qq_1 q_0} \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}^{[q]})^{q_0 - \mu(\mathfrak{m}) + 1} (I^{[qq_1 q_0]})^{w+1} \\ &\subseteq \left(\mathfrak{m} (I^{w+1})^{[q_1 q_0]} \right)^{[q]}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $x^{q_1 q_0} \in (\mathfrak{m}(I^{w+1})^{[q_1 q_0]})^*$, which shows that $x \in (I^{w+1})^{*\text{sp}}$. $\square$

Corollary 7.5 (Special Briançon-Skoda theorem in characteristic p). *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian regular (or weakly F -regular) local ring of characteristic $p > 0$, $n = \mu(I)$, and w any nonnegative integer. Then*

$$(I^{n+w})^{-\text{sp}} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}I^{w+1}.$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 7.4 and the fact that in a weakly F -regular local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$, $J^{*\text{sp}} = \mathfrak{m}J$ for any proper ideal J of R . $\square$

It would be interesting to prove the above corollary in the equicharacteristic zero case as well, by reduction to characteristic p , or even in mixed characteristic (perhaps using methods of Lipman, Sathaye, Teissier, et. al.).

8. THE SPECIAL PART OF THE INTEGRAL CLOSURE OF MONOMIAL IDEALS

For a standard graded ring S over a field k , there is a unique homogeneous maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, and we may define the special part of the integral closure of a homogeneous ideal J in analogous fashion, namely let $J^{-\text{sp}}$ be the ideal generated by all homogeneous elements x of S such that for some integer t , $x^t \in (\mathfrak{m}J^t)^-$. Then one can show (routinely) that all homogeneous elements of $J^{-\text{sp}}$. Moreover:

Lemma 8.1. *Let S be a standard $\mathbb{N}$ -graded Noetherian domain over a field k , with irrelevant maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let J be a homogeneous ideal of S , and let n be the lowest degree among degrees of elements generating J . Then $J^{-\text{sp}}$ contains no homogeneous elements of degree less than or equal to n .*

Proof. Let x be a homogeneous element of $J^{-\text{sp}}$, and let d be its degree. Then there is some integer $t > 0$ with $x^t \in (\mathfrak{m}J^t)^-$. Hence there is some positive integer k such that

$$x^{tk} \in \mathfrak{m}I^t (\mathfrak{m}J^t, x^t)^{k-1}.$$

The expression on the left-hand side has degree dtk . On the other hand, any element of the expression on the right-hand side has degree greater than or equal to

$$1 + nt + (k - 1) \min\{1 + nt, dt\}.$$

So if $d \leq n$, then

$$dtk \geq 1 + nt + (k - 1)(dt) \geq 1 + kdt,$$

which is a contradiction. $\square$

Convention: For the rest of this section, we will fix a polynomial ring $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ in n variables, using the standard $\mathbb{N}$ -grading, with k a field. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the homogeneous maximal ideal $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Note that if $f \in I$, where I is a monomial ideal, then if we express $f = c_1 m_1 + \dots + c_r m_r$ where the m_i are monomials in the variables x_j and the $c_i \in k$ (any such f has a unique such expression, of course), then $m_i \in I$ for all i . This is due to the $\mathbb{N}^n$ -(multi)graded nature of the polynomial ring R . We will use this fact repeatedly, sometimes without mentioning it.

It is folk knowledge (see, e.g. [Eis95, Exercises 4.22-23]) that if we let $\Gamma(I)$ denote the set of exponents (as elements of $\mathbb{N}^n$) of the monomials in a monomial ideal I , then

$$\Gamma(I^-) = \text{conv}(\Gamma(I)) \cap \mathbb{N}^n,$$

where “conv” denotes the convex hull of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Another way of expressing this set is as follows. Let $\{x^{\beta_1}, \dots, x^{\beta_r}\}$ be a minimal set of generators of I . (Here we use double subscripting, so that $\beta_{i,j}$ is the exponent of x_j in the monomial m_i .) Then for a monomial x^α , $\alpha \in \Gamma(I^-)$ if and only if there exist nonnegative rational numbers $c_1, \dots, c_r$ such that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r c_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \geq \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \beta_i.$$

The partial ordering on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we use is the standard one, where $\gamma \geq \delta$ if $\gamma_i \geq \delta_i$ for all i , and $\gamma > \delta$ means both that $\gamma \geq \delta$ and that $\gamma \neq \delta$.

With this latter characterization of integral closure of a monomial ideal, we are ready to describe the special part of the integral closure in similar terms.

Proposition 8.2. *Let $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where k is a field, and $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Let I be a monomial ideal of R contained in $\mathfrak{m}$, minimally generated by monomials $\{x^{\beta_1}, \dots, x^{\beta_r}\}$. Then $I^{-\text{sp}}$ is also a monomial ideal, and for a monomial x^α , $\alpha \in \Gamma(I^{-\text{sp}})$ if and only if there exist nonnegative rational numbers $c_1, \dots, c_r$ such that*

$$(5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r c_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha > \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \beta_i.$$

Proof. First we show that $I^{-\text{sp}}$ is a monomial ideal. Let $f = b_1 m_1 + \dots + b_u m_u \in I^{-\text{sp}}$, where the m_i are distinct monomials and $0 \neq b_i \in k$ for all i . Then there is some positive integer t such that $f^t \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}} I^t$. In particular, since the latter is a monomial ideal, $m_i^t \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}} I^t$ for $i = 1, \dots, u$, which means that $m_i \in I^{-\text{sp}}$ for each i .

Now, let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, and suppose that $x^\alpha \in I^{-\text{sp}}$. Then there is some t with $x^{t\alpha} \in \overline{\mathbf{m}I^t}$. Then by Vitulli [Vit03, Corollary 3.2], there is some s with $x^{st\alpha} \in \mathbf{m}^s I^{st}$. In particular, there exists a positive integer q with $x^{q\alpha} \in \mathbf{m}I^q$. This means that $x^{q\alpha}$ is a multiple of one of the generating monomials of $\mathbf{m}I^q$. In particular, there exist nonnegative integers $p_1, \dots, p_r$ such that

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r p_i = q \quad \text{and} \quad q\alpha > p_1\beta_1 + \dots + p_r\beta_r.$$

(The “ $>$ ” is because $x^{q\alpha} \in \mathbf{m}I^q$, and not merely in I^q .) Then dividing through by q and letting $c_i = p_i/q$, we get (5).

Conversely, suppose that α and $c_1, \dots, c_r$ satisfy (5). Since the c_i are rational, they have a common denominator, say q , so that there are nonnegative integers $p_1, \dots, p_r$ such that $c_i = p_i/q$ for each i , satisfying (6). Hence $x^{q\alpha} \in \mathbf{m}I^q$, which means that $x^\alpha \in I^{-\text{sp}}$. $\square$

We use this to tell us exactly when special decomposition of integral closure fails for monomial ideals. First, for any subset C of $\mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\text{low}(C) := \{P \in C \mid Q \not\prec P \text{ for all } Q \in C\},$$

the “lowest points” of C .

Corollary 8.3. *Let $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where k is a field, and $\mathbf{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Let I be an ideal of R minimally generated by distinct nontrivial monomials $\{x^{\beta_1}, \dots, x^{\beta_r}\}$. Let $S = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r\}$. Then $\Gamma(I^-)$ is the disjoint union of $\Gamma(I^{-\text{sp}})$ with $\text{low}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \mathbb{N}^n$. Hence, $I^- = I + I^{-\text{sp}}$ if and only if $S = \text{low}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \mathbb{N}^n$.*

For example, if $I = (x^t, y^t)$, we have $I^{-\text{sp}} = \mathbf{m}I$, but $I^- = (x, y)^t$, so the decomposition fails if $t > 1$. In general, if $I = (x_1^{p_1}, \dots, x_n^{p_n})$ for integers p_i , then the decomposition holds if and only if whenever $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, $\gcd(p_i, p_j) = 1$.

9. INTERSECTIONS AND COMPATIBILITY

Lemma 9.1. *Let I be a proper ideal in the local ring $(R, \mathbf{m})$ of characteristic $p > 0$. Then $I^{-\text{sp}} \cap I^* = I^{*\text{sp}}$.*

Proof. Let $f \in I^{-\text{sp}} \cap I^*$. Then there is some q_1 with $f^{q_1} \in \overline{\mathbf{m}I^{q_1}}$, and some q_0 and some $c \in R^\circ$ with $cf^q \in I^{[q]}$ for all $q \geq q_0$. Thus, there is some $d \in R^\circ$ such that for all powers q, q_2 of p , $df^{qq_1q_2} \in \mathbf{m}^{qq_2} I^{qq_1q_2}$.

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
cd(f^{q_1 q_2})^q &= cd f^{qq_1 q_2} \in \mathfrak{m}^{qq_2} I^{qq_1 q_2} \cap I^{[qq_1 q_2]} \\
&\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{qq_2} (I^{q_2 - \mu(I) + 1})^{[q q_1]} \cap I^{[qq_1 q_2]} \\
&\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{qq_2} I^{[q q_1]} \cap I^{[qq_1 q_2]} \\
&\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{qq_2 - r} I^{[qq_1 q_2]} \\
&\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{[q]} I^{[qq_1 q_2]} = (\mathfrak{m} I^{[q_1 q_2]})^{[q]}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f^{q_1 q_2} \in (\mathfrak{m} I^{[q_1 q_2]})^*$, so $f \in I^{*\text{sp}}$. $\square$

Lemma 9.2. *If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is an excellent analytically irreducible local ring and I is a $*$ -independent ideal in R , then $I^{*\text{sp}} \cap I^F = I^{F\text{sp}}$.*

Proof. Let $f \in I^{*\text{sp}} \cap I^F$, and let $f_1, \dots, f_d$ be a $*$ -independent generating set of I . Then there is some power q_1 of p such that $f^{q_1} \in I^{[q_1]}$. Hence

$$f^{q_1} = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i f_i^{q_1}.$$

Also, there is some q_0 such that $c f^q \in \mathfrak{m}^{[q/q_0]} I^{[q]}$ for all $q \gg 0$. That is,

$$c f^q = \sum_{i=1}^d m_{iq} f_i^q,$$

where $m_{iq} \in \mathfrak{m}^{[q/q_0]}$ for all such q . On the other hand, from the first displayed equation we also have

$$c f^q = \sum_{i=1}^d c a_i^{q/q_1} f_i^q.$$

Combining the previous two displayed equations, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^d (c a_i^{q/q_1} - m_{iq}) f_i^q = 0.$$

Since $f_1, \dots, f_d$ are $*$ -independent and the colon criterion [Abe01, Proposition 2.4] holds in R , there is some power $q_2 \geq \max\{q_0, q_1\}$ of p such that $c a_i^{q/q_1} - m_{iq} \in \mathfrak{m}^{[q/q_2]}$, so that $c a_i^{q/q_1} \in \mathfrak{m}^{[q/q_2]}$ for all $q \gg 0$ and all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Hence $a_i^{q_2/q_1} \in \mathfrak{m}^* = \mathfrak{m}$, which implies that $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}$. So we have $f^{q_1} \in \mathfrak{m} I^{[q_1]}$, whence $f \in I^{F\text{sp}}$. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor Craig Huneke for constant support and advice during the development of these results.

REFERENCES

- [Abe01] Ian M. Aberbach, *Extension of weakly and strongly F -regular rings by flat maps*, J. Algebra **241** (2001), 799–807.
- [BS74] Joël Briançon and Henri Skoda, *Sur la clôture intégrale d'un idéal de germes de fonctions holomorphes en un point de $\mathbf{C}^n$* , C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A **278** (1974), 949–951.
- [EH] Neil Epstein and Mel Hochster, *Special integral closure, interior integral closure, and continuous closure*, in preparation.
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [EM97] David Eisenbud and Barry Mazur, *Evolutions, symbolic squares, and Fitting ideals*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **488** (1997), 189–201.
- [Eps05] Neil Epstein, *A tight closure analogue of analytic spread*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **139** (2005), no. 2, 371–383.
- [FV] Louiza Fouli and Janet Vassilev, *The cl -core of an ideal*, to appear in Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.
- [HH90] Melvin Hochster and Craig Huneke, *Tight closure, invariant theory, and the Briançon-Skoda theorem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 1, 31–116.
- [HH99] ———, *Tight closure in equal characteristic zero*, book-length preprint, 1999.
- [HS06] Craig Huneke and Irena Swanson, *Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 336, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [Hüb99] Reinhold Hübl, *Evolutions and valuations associated to an ideal*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **517** (1999), 81–100.
- [Hun86] Craig Huneke, *The primary components of and integral closures of ideals in 3-dimensional regular local rings*, Math. Ann. **275** (1986), 617–635.
- [LS81] Joseph Lipman and Avinash Sathaye, *Jacobian ideals and a theorem of Briançon-Skoda*, Michigan Math. J. **28** (1981), no. 2, 199–222.
- [NR54] D. G. Northcott and D. Rees, *Reductions of ideals in local rings*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **50** (1954), no. 2, 145–158.
- [Ree88] D. Rees, *Lectures on the asymptotic theory of ideals*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 113, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [Vas09] Janet C. Vassilev, *Structure on the set of closure operations of a commutative ring*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), no. 10, 2737–2753.
- [Vit03] Marie A. Vitulli, *Some normal monomial ideals*, Topics in algebraic and noncommutative geometry (Luminy/Annapolis, MD, 2001), Contemp. Math., vol. 324, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 205–217.
- [Vra02] Adela Vraciu, *$*$ -independence and special tight closure*, J. Algebra **249** (2002), 544–565.
- [Vra06] ———, *Chains and families of tightly closed ideals*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **38** (2006), 201–208.

E-mail address: nepstein@uos.de

UNIVERSITÄT OSNABRÜCK, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, 49069 OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY